

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Responsive to the Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims in this application to patentably distinguish over the references cited in the rejection of Claims 54 through 64 in the Office Action of March 3, 2006.

Claims 43 through 53 currently stand withdrawn.

Claim 58 has been canceled and Claim 54 has been amended to include recitation from Claim 58 and to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record in this application. Dependent Claims 55 through 57 and 59 through 64 remain in the application with respective amendments to show proper dependency and to more clearly recite certain elements in the claims, respectively.

Reconsideration for allowance of Claims 54 through 57 and 59 through 64 is requested for the cogent reasons set forth herein.

Claim 54 has been amended to recite a system for promotion of intellectual property over the Internet wherein a computer program module for public access to at least part of a description of an intellectual property item is provided to provide access thereto from consumer stations and industry stations. Claim 54 further includes a computer program module for accessing feedback data by industry stations which are registered with the host station to access the feedback data. Still further, Claim 54 has been amended to recite a computer program module for sending from a customer computer station connected to the Internet network to the host station intellectual property data representative of an intellectual property item held by the customer. In at least these respects Claim 54 is believed to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art of record.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 54 through 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teaching of U.S. Patent 4,603,232 to Kurland in view of U.S. Patent 6,233,564 to Schulze, Jr., and further in view of U.S.

Patent 6,236,975 to Boe et al. All of the prior art references are directed to methods and systems for collecting market survey information but none of the systems disclosed in the references comprise or suggest the provision of a system for promoting intellectual property wherein a computer program module is provided for public access to at least part of a description of an intellectual property item from a consumer station and an industry station together with a computer program module which provides access to feedback data by an industry station which is registered with the host station of the system. Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest the provision of a system which includes a computer program module for sending from a customer computer station (a customer of the system) connected to the network to the host station intellectual property data of a property item held by the customer. The Kurland reference discloses a method for accumulating market survey data from individual panelists, storing the market data and subsequently transmitting it back to a host computer and wherein multiple different surveys can be communicated to individual panelists or groups of panelists. However, Kurland et al. does not disclose or suggest a system wherein a consumer may communicate survey information to the host station which may be accessed by an industry station which is registered with the host station and also wherein the host station may receive from a customer of the system data representative of an intellectual property item held by the customer.

The systems and methods disclosed in the Schulze, Jr., and Boe et al. references, taken alone or in combination with Kurland et al., are not believed to make obvious the combination of features set forth in amended Claim 54 and the claims dependent thereon, respectively. Schulze, Jr., for example, describes a system and method for merchandising wherein consumer benefit receipts such as coupons, vouchers or rebate features are used as an incentive in obtaining consumer information.

However, Schulze, Jr. does not disclose or suggest the provision of a system for promoting intellectual property which allows public access by a consumer to provide market survey information (feedback data), which also allows access by a registered industry station so that the industry user may determine the degree of interest in an intellectual property item by the consumer and further wherein the system provides access by a "customer" of the system to add data regarding an intellectual property item of the customer to the system for viewing by consumer stations and by industry stations.

Still further, with respect to the Boe et al. reference, this patent describes a system wherein a consumer is encouraged to complete a series of questions in consideration for receiving feedback showing where the consumer stands relative to its peers or how the consumer's responses compare to the responses of other consumers with the same or similar demographics. Boe et al. does not disclose or suggest the provision of a system for promoting intellectual property which allows public access by consumers who respond to questions to give feedback data and access by so-called industry stations which are registered with the system to receive information regarding the degree of interest in a property item listed on the system. Still further, Boe et al. does not disclose or suggest the provision of a program module of the system which allows customers of the system to input information regarding an intellectual property item held by the customer.

Accordingly, Claim 54 which has been amended to, essentially, include the recitation of canceled Claim 58 together with other amendments which clearly distinguish the claim over the prior art. Claim 54 is believed to be patentable and reconsideration for allowance of Claim 54, as amended herein, is respectfully solicited.

Claims 55 through 57 and 59 through 64 remain in the application depending directly or indirectly from amended Claim 54 and are believed to be patentable at least for the reasons

Appl. No. 09/518,699  
Amendment Dated September 5, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 3, 2006

set forth above in support of the patentability of Claim 54. Consideration for allowance of Claims 55 through 57 and 59 through 64 is therefore also respectfully requested.

Applicant has made a further diligent effort to advance the prosecution of this application by making amendments to the claims in this application and by pointing out with particularity herein how the claims distinguish patentably over the prior art cited. An early Notice of Allowance of Claims 54 through 57 and 59 through 64 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Sept. 5, 2006

Michael E. Martin  
Michael E. Martin  
Registration No. 24,821  
Agent for Applicant

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP  
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000  
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761  
Phone (214) 999-4052  
Fax (214) 999-3052

DALLAS 1699147v1